

3/16/75
P.A. 15

Police Surveillance: Two First Hand Views

It was fascinating to read about my undeserved significance to the D. C. Police Department in the February 15th edition of The Washington Post. Some subsequent observations:

- Friends have quietly compared their superior contributions to civil rights, anti-war issues, abortion reform and ERA support to mine. Alas, most are correct and all I can do is apologize, I am sorry I was surveilled and these wonderful people were not. Life is never fair.

- I would like to think we (the women's movement) were important enough to warrant real undercover agents. Unfortunately, I am forced to believe that it was my husband and not me or the movement that was significant during 1969-72.

- Mentioning me, in the same article, with the undercover monitoring of Sargent Shriver has probably ruined my radical reputation, if I ever had one.

- Jim D. Binsted has guts, discussing with you his undercover work. However, his wife, Dorie, will not get my vote of confidence unless she insists on being fully paid for finding out "what she (Mrs. Hobson) says and who she hangs around with and what does she think." Anyone with that assignment should have been paid double-time to compensate for boredom. I would be happy to help in her case.

- This incident is only funny in its

stupidity. With home rule, D.C. citizens now must learn the relationship of our Police Department to the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency and the White House. Some standards have to be established and understood to control police surveillance of non-criminal activities. It is up to everyone to work toward this goal.

Washington.

Tina Hobson.

In response to ex-chief Wilson's column (Post, February 21) regarding police intelligence and political leaders, I would enjoy voicing some overlooked matters and also give a personal opinion.

Being a four year veteran of the city's police department (now resigned) and an ex-intelligence officer during that period, I saw first-hand the surveillance activities conducted on political groups and individuals. The chief's column attempts to stymie and rationalize public concern by contending that *everyone* should know by now that spying on public figures was common, and it should not come as a surprise.

Then comes the justification for its necessity. Granted, groups whose philosophy was based on violence, as were the BUF, Yippies and others, needed close monitoring. Granted, at large ral-

lies and demonstrations, intelligence operations were needed for crowd control and movement. And granted, we all know that organized crime needs monitoring. Unfortunately, the column evades and does not justify the case at hand: political surveillance.

Since when is the incumbent political party and its leadership seen lawful to influence, manipulate and use a non-partisan law enforcement intelligence agency? Why should there be political surveillance against groups or persons who may differ in political or economic philosophy yet present no physical threat to anyone?

Is it proper to secretly keep intelligence records on social reformers alongside records of Cosa Nostra figures? Can we consider Julius Hobson and his wife un-American desperadoes while the opulent Bebe Rebozo is epitomized as a patriot?

The local political espionage can be considered just a small missing piece of the mammoth Nixon spy puzzle. A puzzle which is slowly being pieced together (Watergate, FBI, CIA, etc.) and our small piece logically fits in place. The pity is to see Chief Wilson attempt to bury our piece to save face for both himself and the department who were unwittingly used as a political tool.

James D. Binsted.

Cabin John, Md.